



# San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan Draft Revised EIR



**August 2010**



Prepared by:  
**GAIA Consulting, Inc.**  
with assistance from  
Grassetti Environmental  
Consulting, URS Corpora-  
tion, and H.T. Harvey &  
Associates

SCH # 2007112080

Prepared for:  
**California State Coastal Conservancy**  
1330 Broadway,  
Suite 1300  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Tel: (510) 286-1015  
Fax: (510) 286-0470





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ES.</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	
ES.1	Introduction.....	ES-1
ES.2	Project Description.....	ES-1
ES.3	Alternatives.....	ES-3
ES.4	Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigations.....	ES-4
<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1	Overview of the Project.....	1-1
1.2	Water Trail Plan Purpose and Need.....	1-1
1.3	CEQA Compliance.....	1-2
1.4	Public Involvement and Scoping.....	1-4
1.5	Document Organization.....	1-5
<b>2.</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	
2.1	Water Trail Overview.....	2-1
2.1.1	The Water Trail Act.....	2-1
2.1.2	Water Trail Purpose and Need.....	2-2
2.1.3	Water Trail Plan Development.....	2-4
2.1.4	Water Trail Location.....	2-4
2.1.5	Surrounding Land Use.....	2-5
2.2	Non-Motorized Small Boating in the Bay Area.....	2-5
2.2.1	Boating in the San Francisco Estuary.....	2-5
2.2.2	Projected Growth in Non-Motorized Small Boat Use.....	2-10
2.2.3	Boating Regulations.....	2-13
2.2.4	Use of Non-Motorized Small Boats.....	2-14
2.3	Water Trail Plan.....	2-22
2.3.1	Overview of the Water Trail Plan.....	2-22
2.3.2	Water Trail Sites.....	2-23
2.3.3	Water Trail Development and Management Strategies.....	2-32
2.3.4	Site Facility Enhancements.....	2-37
2.3.5	Public Outreach, Education, and Stewardship.....	2-39
2.3.6	Other WT Plan Considerations.....	2-41
2.4	Water Trail Plan Implementation.....	2-41
2.4.1	Water Trail Plan Implementation Overview.....	2-41
2.4.2	Water Trail Implementation Roles and Responsibilities.....	2-42
2.4.3	Trailhead Designation Process.....	2-50
2.4.4	Other Water Trail Implementation Tasks.....	2-58
2.5	Permits and Approvals.....	2-59
<b>3.0</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	
3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.1.1	Initial Study Findings.....	3-1
3.1.2	Organization of Chapter 3.....	3-1
3.1.3	Overview of Impact Analysis in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.....	3-2

3.2	Regulatory Setting .....	3-4
	3.2.1 Federal Laws, Regulations and Related Plans .....	3-4
	3.2.2 State and Regional Laws, Regulations, and Related Plans .....	3-10
	3.2.3 Other Regional and Local Plans and Policies .....	3-18
3.3	Recreation .....	3-19
	3.3.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-19
	3.3.2 Regional Setting.....	3-19
	3.3.3 Local Setting .....	3-27
	3.3.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-27
	3.3.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-32
3.4	Navigational Safety.....	3-38
	3.4.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-38
	3.4.2 Regional Setting.....	3-38
	3.4.3 Local Setting .....	3-46
	3.4.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-46
	3.4.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-48
3.5	Public Services.....	3-52
	3.5.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-52
	3.5.2 Regional Setting.....	3-52
	3.5.3 Local Setting .....	3-52
	3.5.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-52
	3.5.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-53
3.6	Aesthetics.....	3-56
	3.6.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-56
	3.6.2 Regional Setting.....	3-56
	3.6.3 Local Setting .....	3-57
	3.6.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-57
	3.6.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-62
3.7	Biological Resources – Vegetation.....	3-69
	3.7.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-69
	3.7.2 Regional Setting.....	3-69
	3.7.3 Local Setting .....	3-83
	3.7.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-83
	3.7.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-86
3.8	Biological Resources – Birds.....	3-93
	3.8.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-93
	3.8.2 Regional Setting.....	3-93
	3.8.3 Local Setting .....	3-111
	3.8.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-111
	3.8.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-115
3.9	Biological Resources – Other Species .....	3-132
	3.9.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-132
	3.9.2 Regional Setting.....	3-132
	3.9.3 Local Setting .....	3-141
	3.9.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-141
	3.9.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-143

3.10	Cultural Resources .....	3-157
	3.10.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-157
	3.10.2 Regional Setting.....	3-157
	3.10.3 Local Setting .....	3-157
	3.10.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-163
	3.10.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-165
3.11	Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	3-168
	3.11.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-168
	3.11.2 Regional Setting.....	3-168
	3.11.3 Local Setting .....	3-168
	3.11.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-168
	3.11.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-169
3.12	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	3-171
	3.12.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-171
	3.12.2 Regional Setting.....	3-171
	3.12.3 Local Setting .....	3-175
	3.12.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-175
	3.12.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-179
3.13	Land Use Planning.....	3-183
	3.13.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-183
	3.13.2 Regional Setting.....	3-183
	3.13.3 Local Setting .....	3-183
	3.13.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-184
	3.13.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-192
3.14	Transportation, Circulation, and Parking.....	3-194
	3.14.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-194
	3.14.2 Regional Setting.....	3-194
	3.14.3 Local Setting .....	3-194
	3.14.4 Regulatory Setting .....	3-195
	3.14.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	3-196
3.15	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change .....	3-199
	3.15.1 Initial Study Findings.....	3-199
	3.15.2 Climate Change Background.....	3-199
	3.15.3 Regional Setting.....	3-200
	3.15.4 Local Setting .....	3-201
	3.15.5 Regulatory Setting .....	3-202
	3.15.6 Impacts and Best Performance Standards.....	3-207
<b>4.0</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND OTHER CEQA SECTIONS</b>	
4.1	Cumulative Impacts .....	4-1
	4.1.1 Cumulative Projects Considered in This EIR .....	4-1
	4.1.2 Impacts of Project Combined with Cumulative Projects and Projected Non-WT-Induced Increased Boating.....	4-4
4.2	Growth-Inducing Impacts .....	4-10
4.3	Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects .....	4-11
4.4	Irreversible/Irretrievable Environmental Effects .....	4-11

<b>5.0</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT</b>	
5.1	General CEQA Requirements for Alternative Evaluation.....	5-1
5.2	Project Alternatives.....	5-1
	5.2.1 Alternatives Considered and Rejected from Further Analysis .....	5-1
	5.2.2 Alternatives Evaluated in this EIR.....	5-2
5.3	Evaluation of Alternatives .....	5-2
	5.3.1 Alternative 1: No Project .....	5-2
	5.3.2 Alternative 2: High Opportunity Sites Only .....	5-7
	5.3.3 Alternative 3: Enhanced Water Trail Plan Alternative .....	5-12
5.4	Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	5-17
<b>6.0</b>	<b>REPORT PREPARERS, REFERENCES AND GLOSSARY</b>	
6.1	Preparers of the Environmental Impact Report .....	6-1
6.2	References and Persons Contacted .....	6-2
6.3	Glossary .....	6-24

**APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A: WATER TRAIL ACT

APPENDIX B: INITIAL STUDY

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

APPENDIX D: LIST OF STRATEGIES

APPENDIX E: PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS CHECKLIST FOR TRAILHEAD DESIGNATION  
PROCESS

APPENDIX F: LOCAL CLIMATE ACTION PLANS

APPENDIX G: METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATING GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSIONS FROM THE  
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER TRAIL

APPENDIX H: SUPPLEMENTAL STRATEGIES FOR THE ENHANCED WATER TRAIL PLAN  
ALTERNATIVE

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE ES-1. Summary of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	ES-5
TABLE 2.2.1-1. Estimated Number of NMSBs by Boat Type in California.....	2-9
TABLE 2.3.2-1. Water Trail Backbone Sites.....	2-24
TABLE 2.3.3-1. Strategies for WT Implementation .....	2-33
TABLE 2.4.1-1. Water Trail Implementation Roles and Responsibilities .....	2-43
TABLE 2.4.3-1. Site Description Components.....	2-53
TABLE 3.3.2-1. Non-Motorized Boating Groups and Organizations.....	3-20
TABLE 3.3.3-1. WT Backbone Sites Adjacent to Existing Bay Trail Spine.....	3-28
TABLE 3.4.2-1. USCG National Fatality Data for Canoes and Kayaks -- 2005 .....	3-40
TABLE 3.4.2-2. Type of Non-Motorized Boating Accident in California (1995 to 2006) .....	3-40
TABLE 3.4.2-3. Number of Non-Motorized Boating Death and Injury Accidents by Vessel Type in California (1995 to 2006) .....	3-40
TABLE 3.4.2-4. Regulated Navigation Areas .....	3-44
TABLE 3.6.3-1. Visual Setting of Backbone Sites.....	3-58
TABLE 3.7.2-1. Special-status Plant Species with Potential to be Affected by WT Plan .....	3-76
TABLE 3.7.2-2. Selected Invasive Plants of Tidal Marshes and Adjacent Baylands .....	3-82
TABLE 3.8.2-1. Results of USFWS Aerial Bird Surveys, 1990-2007 (Excluding 1996).....	3-96
TABLE 3.8.2-2. Sensitive Birds and Existing Levels of Potential Disturbance.....	3-100
TABLE 3.9.2-1. Harbor Seal Haul-out Sites by San Francisco Bay Subregion and Segment .	3-134
TABLE 3.9.2-2. Recent Maximum Counts at Four Primary San Francisco Bay Haul-Out Sites, By Season.....	3-135
TABLE 3.9.5-1: Proposed WT Backbone Sites located within 4 miles of Known Harbor Seal Haul-Out Sites .....	3-148
TABLE 3.9.5-2. Proposed WT Backbone Sites located within 4 miles of Known Harbor Seal Popping Sites .....	3-151
TABLE 3.10.3-1. WT Sites and Archaeological Sites.....	3-158
TABLE 3.12.4-1. Water Quality Objectives for Coliform Bacteria .....	3-178
TABLE 3.12.4-2. US EPA Bacteriological Criteria for Water Contact Recreation .....	3-178
TABLE 3.15-1. California 2004 Emission Breakdown.....	3-200
TABLE 3.15-2. Bay Area 2007 Emissions Breakdown.....	3-201
TABLE 3.15-3. BAAQMD GHG Thresholds of Significance.....	3-205
TABLE 3.15-4. Summary of GHG Emissions Attributable to the Water Trail.....	3-209
TABLE 3.15-5. Summary of GHG Emission Reductions Expected from Implementation of the Water Trail Project .....	3-210

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b><u>FIGURE NUMBER</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
FIGURE 2.1.4-1A. Proposed Water Trail Backbone Access Sites, San Pablo and Suisun Bay ...	2-6
FIGURE 2.1.4-1B. Proposed Water Trail Backbone Access Sites, San Francisco Bay .....	2-7
FIGURE 2.2.4-1. Water Trail User Groups.....	2-15
FIGURE 2.2.4-2. Existing Access Sites .....	2-22
FIGURE 2.3.2-1. Proposed Water Trail High Opportunity Sites.....	2-31
FIGURE 2.4.3-1. Trailhead Designation Flowchart.....	2-51
FIGURE 3.4.2-1. Regulated Navigation Areas in the San Francisco Bay Area VTS .....	3-42
FIGURE 3.4.2-2. Existing and Proposed Ferry Routes.....	3-45
FIGURE 3.6.5-1a-f. Visual Character of WT Sites as Seen from Land.....	3-65
FIGURE 3.7.2-1. Bayland Habitats .....	3-70
FIGURE 3.7.2-2. Bay Subregions .....	3-72
FIGURE 3.8.2-1. Maximum Counts of Rafting Birds .....	3-97
FIGURE 3.8.2-2. Clapper Rail Habitats .....	3-103
FIGURE 3.8.2-3. Western Snowy Plover and California Least Tern Habitats .....	3-104
FIGURE 3.8.2-4. Heron and Egret Rookeries .....	3-105
FIGURE 3.9.2-1. Harbor Seal Haul-Out Sites .....	3-136

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This executive summary provides an overview of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail (Water Trail, or WT) Plan, including the environmental analysis, impacts and mitigation measures. Detailed information regarding the proposed WT Project and potential issues associated with implementation of the WT is provided in Chapters 1 through 5 of this DEIR.

### ES.1 INTRODUCTION

The San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail (Water Trail, or WT) strives to create a network of access sites, or “trailheads,” that allow people in small, non-motorized boats, such as kayaks, canoes, sailboards, and dragon boats, to safely enjoy the historic, scenic, and environmental richness of San Francisco Bay through single and multiple-day trips on the Bay. The Water Trail would bring education about personal boating, navigational safety, and appropriate boating behavior near sensitive wildlife species and shoreline habitat to the boating public through a variety of means. The majority of the 112 trailheads proposed for designation as part of the network already exist and are used by the public. They are located along the shoreline of the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties.

The WT was authorized by the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Act (Water Trail Act), signed into law in September 2005. The Act directed the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), in coordination with other agencies and organizations, to conduct a public process to develop the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan (WT Plan), and assigned the California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC or Conservancy) to be the lead agency for implementing the Plan. The development of the WT Plan was led by BCDC, with the active participation of a broad-based steering committee, stakeholders, and experts on specific topics. All background reports, meeting notes, and the final draft WT Plan itself are posted on BCDC’s website at [www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov).

The SCC is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This document is a Programmatic EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168) in that it analyzes the potential regional and cumulative effects of implementing the WT Plan rather than analyzing the impacts of any particular site-specific project. This DEIR identifies mitigation strategies and measures applicable to general types of potential impacts that may occur from implementation of the Water Trail Plan, including possible trailhead enhancements or the development of new access sites. This approach allows for efficient tiering of subsequent project-level CEQA documents. A DEIR was previously issued for this project on June 12, 2008 and a total of 24 agencies, organizations and individuals provided comments. Those comments were considered in the development of this recirculated DEIR. More detail on the CEQA review process is provided in Chapter 1, Introduction, and Chapter 2, Project Description.

### ES.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail project would implement the Water Trail Plan through a trailhead designation process designed to support improved and safer non-motorized small boat access to San Francisco Bay, and protection of environmental resources through careful

consideration of potential impacts related to implementation of the Plan. The WT Plan (BCDC 2007b) includes trailhead development and management strategies, organizational structure and responsibilities, a trailhead designation process, and guidance on trail planning and program development. The Plan's trailhead development and management strategies promote boater outreach and education; appropriate trailhead location and facility design; and maintenance and operation plans. The WT Plan is a guide to trail implementation for agencies and organizations that will develop and manage the WT program as well as for site owners and managers interested in becoming part of the WT and other stakeholders from around the region.

Of the 112 potential "Backbone Sites" identified in the Water Trail Plan, a subset of 57 were identified as "High Opportunity Sites," meaning that they would need little more than educational signage to meet the criteria for inclusion in the Water Trail Project. Additional access sites may be considered for designation in the future, as appropriate, following the same evaluation procedures as for the sites identified in the Water Trail Plan. Access site improvements may range from signage only to development of entirely new access sites. Typical facility improvements may include, as examples, new docks, ramps, boat storage facilities, parking improvements, and restrooms. Official inclusion of access sites into the Water Trail Project ("trailhead designation") would be accomplished through evaluation of site characteristics and management ("Site Descriptions" for High Opportunity Sites and more elaborate "Trailhead Plans" for all other sites) for each site and decisions would be made at public meetings. The implementation process for the project is described in detail in Chapter 2, Project Description.

The analysis of potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the WT Plan is based on the increase in non-motorized small boat use that could be caused by the Water Trail. To accomplish this first step in the analysis, the potential increase in non-motorized small use needs to be defined. The analysis begins with an examination of existing levels and future increases that would be expected to occur without implementation of the Water Trail (i.e., the non-WT-related growth), and then assesses the elements of the WT that could lead to additional (incremental, WT-induced) growth in NMSB use. The analysis then evaluates the various potential impacts that might be associated with WT-induced growth.

Existing levels of non-motorized small boat use are estimated based on data collected by the California Department of Boating and Waterways in 2006 and 2007 (Cal Boating 2009). Likewise, estimates of the growth of non-motorized small boat use absent the Water Trail are based on the Cal Boating 2009 study. There are neither published estimates (e.g., from local studies or surveys), nor other sources of data to estimate the increment of future growth in non-motorized small boat use on San Francisco Bay that might be attributable solely to the Water Trail. Based on input from recreational experts, this unknown increment is expected to be very small in relation to non-WT-induced growth. This conclusion is based on the challenges of boating on San Francisco Bay (weather, currents, tides, water temperature), the interest of most access site owners/managers in maintaining or improving their sites regardless of the WT (50% of the Backbone Sites are within waterfront parks, for example), the publicity for non-motorized boating on the Bay that already exists, the opportunities for non-motorized boat rentals that already exist, the interest of Bay Area boat owners in recreating on water bodies outside the Bay Area (lakes, rivers, coastline), combined with the already predicted increase in non-motorized

small boat use regardless of the WT. An annual growth rate in the use of non-motorized small boats by people in the San Francisco Bay Region of 3.84% per year is predicted absent the Water Trail (Cal Boating 2009).

The number of participant-days<sup>1</sup> for non-motorized small boat use by individuals residing in the San Francisco Bay Area Region, as defined by Cal Boating (2009), and not including inflatable rafts, is estimated to be 6.2 million in 2010, based on 5.3 million participant days in 2006 and an estimated total of 174,000 non-motorized small boats owned by people from this region in 2006.<sup>2</sup> The number of motorized boats owned by residents of the San Francisco Region (Cal Boating 2002) has been roughly equal to the number of non-motorized small boats owned in the region and used in the region over the past 10 years.

### ES.3 ALTERNATIVES

The DEIR considers the following three alternatives to the Project.

- **Alternative 1 — No Project:** The No Project alternative assumes continued public use of existing sites without any educational/public outreach programs or support for site improvements other than what already exists.
- **Alternative 2 — High Opportunity Sites (HOS) Only:** The HOS Only Alternative would include only the sites that meet HOS criteria. (While the number of sites meeting HOS criteria is not known with certainty, 57 sites were preliminarily identified as HOSs in the WT Plan.) Under this alternative, only sites with minimal improvement needs and no significant management issues would be included in implementation of the Plan. All mitigation measures applicable to the Project would also be incorporated into the HOS Only Alternative to the extent they would apply to this subset of sites.
- **Alternative 3 — Enhanced Water Trail Plan Alternative:** The Enhanced Water Trail Plan Alternative includes four additional strategies to further reduce potential impacts associated with implementation of the WT. Under this alternative the existing WT Plan (BCDC 2007b) would be modified to incorporate four additional strategies: Strategy 25, Comprehensive Education Program; Strategy 26, Navigational Safety; Strategy 27, Boatwashing Facilities; and Strategy 28, GHG Best Management Practices for Construction, Trailhead Operation, and WT Program. All mitigation measures applicable to the Project would also be incorporated into the Enhanced WT Plan.

**Alternatives Considered and Rejected.** Other potential alternatives, including site closure, no major new facility development, carbon-neutral, or limited geographic region alternatives, were considered and rejected as being infeasible for reasons discussed in Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Project. The most broadly applicable reasons for their rejection are the non-regulatory nature of the WT project and the directive of the WT Act to serve the entire nine-county Bay Area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Participant-days are the number of days a boat owner uses his or her boat. A boat owner using a boat three days per year would have three participant-days; a boat owner using a boat 30 days per year would have 30 participant days. The average non-motorized small boat use rate is 24 days per year statewide (Cal Boating 2009).

<sup>2</sup> This number excludes inflatables, which are used only on interior lakes and rivers, and make up 41.5% of non-motorized boats owned by California residents.

**Environmentally Superior Alternative.** The Enhanced Water Trail Plan Alternative was determined to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

#### **ES.4 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS**

The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts on: recreation; navigation; aesthetics; biological resources; cultural resources; hydrology and water quality; and traffic, circulation and parking. Mitigation measures identified in the DEIR would reduce all of these impacts to a less than significant level. The Project would not result in any significant irreversible effects. The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts and growth inducement also would be less than significant.

Table ES-1 presents a summary of potential project impacts. The level of significance of each environmental impact is listed both before and after the application of the mitigation measure(s) identified in this DEIR. For detailed discussions of all project impacts and mitigation measures, please refer to the environmental analysis in Chapter 3 of this DEIR.

This DEIR provides mitigation measures for all potentially significant impacts, including the project's potential contribution to cumulatively significant impacts. Mitigation measures may apply to regional impacts (i.e., impacts associated with the implementation of the WT as a whole) or site-specific impacts. Potential regional impacts will be mitigated through activities undertaken by site owners and managers, and/or as part of the trailhead designation process. Potential site-specific impacts will be mitigated for each site individually. The need to implement the mitigation measures identified in this DEIR is dependent on the degree and type of development proposed for the site, the potential for that development or publicity to substantially increase use of a site, and the location of a site in relation to sensitive wildlife species and habitat and/or potential safety concerns.

Sites meeting HOS criteria have less than significant impacts and therefore would require little or no site-specific mitigation. The applicability of the various site-specific mitigation measures to individual sites would be evaluated during the trailhead designation process. Because site conditions may have changed since the original classification of potential WT access sites into HOSs and non-HOSs was made, all sites will undergo a preliminary environmental screening as part of the trailhead designation process. The environmental review would consider available CEQA documentation for the site, and would use the environmental effects checklist included as a preliminary draft in Appendix E of this document. Although the mitigation measures included in this document are expected to be adequate for the great majority of potential WT sites, site-specific CEQA review would identify the need for any other mitigation measures that may not be included in this document.

**TABLE ES-1. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Name</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Name</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
Rec-1	Regional Effects on Recreation	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rec-2	Increased Use of Existing Sites or Other Recreational Sites Causing Accelerated Physical Deterioration of the Facility or Substantial Unplanned Expansion	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rec-3	Increased Use of WT Sites by Motorized Boats from Implementation of the WT Program	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rec-4	Conflict with, and Preclusion of, Existing Recreation Activities Due to Facility Improvements and Use of WT Sites, or Increased Boating	PS	Rec-M4A	Web-Based Comment Form	LTS
			Rec-M4B	Conduct Recreational Use Evaluations and Develop/Implement Adaptive Management Recommendations if User Conflicts Occur	
			Rec-M4C	Safety Signage	
Nav-1	Increased Risk of Incidents Including Accidents Involving Loss of Life, or Collisions between NMSB Users and Other Boats	PS	Nav-M1A	Develop and Implement Safety Signage	LTS
			Nav-M1B	Sponsor WT Training and Education Programs	
			Nav-M1C	Design of WT Sites near Commercial Shipping and Ferry Terminals	
			Nav-M1D	Planning of Wildlife Buffer Zones	
Nav-2	Increased Risk of Incidents Due to Changes in Facilities or New Sites	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A

**TABLE ES-1. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Name</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Name</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
PS-1	Need for New Facilities or Substantial Increase in Demand for Public Services	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
PS-2	Substantial Expansion of Public Service Needs for Sites Designated for Overnight Use or Unacceptable Increase in Service Ratios, Response Times or Other Public Service Performance Objectives	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Aesth-1	Degradation of Visual Quality of a WT Site or Its Surroundings	PS	Aesth-M1	Include Visual Characteristics and Site Relationships in Design Guidelines and Trailhead Plans	LTS
Aesth-2	Degradation of a Scenic Vista or View from an Eligible State Scenic Highway	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bio-1	Spread of Non-Native Invasive Plants	PS	Bio-M1	Conduct Education and Spread-Reduction Efforts	LTS
Bio-2	Wetland Habitat Impacts Due to Construction, Repair, Rehabilitation, or Maintenance of Trailheads	PS	Bio-M2	Conduct Surveys, Adopt Avoidance Measures, and Instigate Compensatory Mitigation	LTS
Bio-3	Wetland Habitat Impacts Due to Increased Trampling of Wetland Shoreline Vegetation and Soil	PS	Bio-M3	Establish Trailhead Restrictions, Public Education, Surveys, and Signage	LTS
Bio-4	Impacts to Special-Status Wetland Plant Species	PS	Bio-M4	Conduct Surveys, Adopt Avoidance Measures, and Instigate Compensatory Mitigation	LTS

**TABLE ES-1. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Name</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Name</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
Bio-5	Disturbance of Rafting Waterfowl from Roosting and Foraging Habitat	PS	Bio-M5	Avoid Disturbance of Rafting Waterfowl from Roosting or Foraging Habitat	LTS
Bio-6	Disturbance of Wading Bird, Shorebird, and Brown Pelican Roosting and Foraging Habitat	PS	Bio-M6	Avoid Disturbance of California Brown Pelicans From Roosting and Foraging Habitat	LTS
Bio-7	Disturbance of Bird Nesting Habitat	PS	Bio-M7	Avoid Disturbance of Bird Nesting Habitat	LTS
Bio-8	Disturbance of California Clapper Rails and California Black Rails	PS	Bio-M8	Avoid Disturbance of California Clapper Rails and California Black Rails	LTS
Bio-9	Disturbance of Non-Listed Marsh Birds	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bio-10	Potential Incidental Take of Sensitive Species	PS	Bio-M5 through Bio-M8	See Mitigation Names for Bio-M5 through Bio-M8, above	LTS
Bio-11	Disturbance of California Clapper Rails and California Black Rails due to Construction Activities at Launch Sites	PS	Bio-M11	Avoid Disturbance of California Clapper Rails and California Black Rails due to Construction Activities at Launch Sites	LTS
Bio-12	Regional Impacts on Special-Status Small Mammals of Bayland Marshes	PS	Bio-M12, Bio-M3, and Bio-M4	Undertake Avoidance Measures	LTS
Bio-13	Regional Impacts on Northwest Pond Turtles	PS	Bio-M12	Undertake Avoidance Measures	LTS

**TABLE ES-1. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Name</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Name</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
Bio-14	Disturbance to Harbor Seals Due to Increased NMSB Presence Near Haul-Out Sites	PS	Bio-M14A	Review Improvements at Certain Sites and Implement Education and Outreach--Educate NMSB Users in Vicinity of Pupping Sites	LTS
			Bio-M14B	Review Improvements at Certain Sites and Implement Education and Outreach--Buffer Zone Signage and Other Markers	
Bio-15	Avoidance or Abandonment of Traditional Harbor Seal Haul-out Sites Due to Increased NMSB Use	PS	Bio-M15	Seasonal Closures, Monitoring and Adaptive Management	LTS
Bio-16	Construction and Trailhead Impacts on Special-Status Animals of Bayland Marshes	PS	Bio-M15, Bio-M2 and Bio-M3	Undertake Waste Management, Predator Control, and Basking Impact Minimization (see above for Bio-M2 and Bio-M3)	LTS
Bio-17	Disturbance to Harbor Seals Due to Construction	PS	Bio-M17	Provide Mitigation for Disturbance to Harbor Seals Due to Construction/Improvements at WT Sites	LTS
Cult-1	Disturbance to Prehistoric Archaeological Deposits During Use of the Water Trail	PS	Cult-M1	Include Protection of Cultural Resources in Education and Outreach Efforts	LTS

**TABLE ES-1. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Name</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Name</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
Cult-2	Disturbance to Prehistoric Archaeological Deposits During Facility Improvements and/or Use of the Water Trail	PS	Cult-M2A	Undertake Expanded Archival Research and Field Investigations to Provide Information About Potential Prehistoric Archaeological Deposits	
			Cult-M2B	Protect Prehistoric Archaeological Remains in Adjacent Areas	LTS
Haz-1	Exposure of Workers, the Public, or Wildlife to Contaminated Soil or Groundwater from Soil Excavation	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hyd-1	Local Degradation of Water Quality Due to Construction Activities	PS	Hyd-M1	Employ Construction Best Management Practices	LTS
Hyd-2:	Degradation of Water Quality due to Runoff from Trailheads	PS	Hyd-M2	Implement Stormwater Best Management Practices	LTS
Hyd-3	Degradation of Water Quality due to Improper Sanitation	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hyd-4	Increased Littering in the Bay	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hyd-5	Placement of Structures Within 100-Year Flood Zones that Could Impede or Redirect Flows	PS	Hyd-M5	Design All New Permanent Structures to Address Potential Flood Hazards	LTS
LUP-1	Conflict with Federal, State, or Local Land Use Plans and Policies	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
LUP-2	Incompatibility with Adjacent or Nearby Land Uses	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A

**TABLE ES-1. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Name</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Name</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
TPC-1	Degradation in Levels of Service on Access Roadways	PS	TPC-M1	Undertake Traffic Assessment Prior to Designation of New or Enhanced WT Sites	
TPC-2	Inadequate Parking at New or Improved WT Trailheads	PS	TPC-M2	Undertake Parking Study Prior to Development of New or Enhanced WT Sites	LTS
TPC-3	Inadequate Emergency Vehicle Access	PS	TPC-M3	Evaluate Emergency Vehicle Access at New WT Sites and Sites with Substantial Improvements	LTS
TPC-4	Hazards Due to Unsafe Access Roadways	PS	TPC-M4	Evaluate Plans for New WT Sites to Determine Safety for Vehicle Access	LTS
GHG-1	Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions Attributable to the Implementation of the Water Trail	LTS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Notes: LTS      Less than significant N/A      Not applicable PS        Potentially Significant					

---

# 1 INTRODUCTION

---



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail (Water Trail or WT) Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR or DEIR) is a Program EIR that addresses the potential environmental effects of implementing the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan (Water Trail Plan, WT Plan, or Plan). This chapter of the Draft EIR provides a brief overview of the WT Plan (BCDC 2007b), the purpose and need for the Plan, the environmental review and compliance process, public involvement and outreach, and the organization of the Draft EIR.

### 1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

The San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail strives to identify and designate a network of access sites, or “trailheads,” that would allow people in non-motorized small boats (such as kayaks, sailboards, and dragon boats) to safely enjoy the historic, scenic, and environmental richness of San Francisco Bay (SF Bay or Bay) through single and multiple-day trips. The trail network would be designated through the process described in the Water Trail Plan. The Water Trail would bring education about personal boating, navigational safety, and appropriate boating behavior near sensitive wildlife species and shoreline habitat to the boating public through a variety of means. The majority of the 112 trailhead sites proposed for designation as part of the network already exist and are used by the public. The proposed sites are located along the shoreline of the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties.

The WT Plan primary project area is within the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission’s (BCDC’s) jurisdiction, within the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The enabling legislation, the Water Trail Act (Appendix A), and the development of the WT Plan (BCDC 2007b) are summarized in Chapter 2, Project Description. The WT Act does not create any new or additional regulatory or enforcement authority for the agencies implementing the WT Plan.

The WT Plan, currently in final draft form, is a guide to trail implementation for the agencies and organizations that would develop and manage WT access sites and programs, as well as trail proponents and other stakeholders involved in implementation. Recommended policies and procedures in the Plan define how the WT would take shape over time on organizational, program, and project-specific levels. The Plan identifies the 112 potential “Backbone” access sites, including a subset of 57 High Opportunity Sites (HOSs). HOSs are sites that require only minimal improvements (i.e., signage) to qualify for designation as part of the WT. The full text of the WT Plan is available for review on the State Coastal Conservancy’s website ([www.scc.ca.gov](http://www.scc.ca.gov)) and BCDC’s website ([www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov)).

### 1.2 WATER TRAIL PLAN PURPOSE AND NEED

The WT has the potential to enhance Bay Area communities’ connections to the Bay and create new linkages to existing shoreline open space and other regional trails. The WT program, as defined in the WT Plan, is needed to:

- Create a coordinated, linked set of non-motorized small boat (NMSB) access locations allowing single point, multiple point, and multi-day itineraries
- Plan for increased NMSB use associated with regional population growth and changes in population demographics
- Promote safe non-motorized small boating practices
- Increase environmental awareness and sensitivity of NMSB users to minimize potential impacts of NMSB use on sensitive wildlife and habitat
- Promote placement of enhanced facilities and any new access locations in areas where they would provide the greatest recreational benefit and avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts to wildlife and habitat
- Optimize the use of available funding for trailhead improvements and other WT activities
- Ensure protection of private property, and
- Minimize impacts on agricultural operations

The benefits potentially associated with the implementation of the WT Plan are extensive and would include:

- Improved NMSB access to San Francisco Bay
- Reduced impacts to sensitive wildlife and habitat, and other resources through appropriately directing the location and types of development associated with access sites and through education of boaters
- Increased high quality information regarding NMSB access facilities through the development of educational and outreach materials
- Increased stewardship of the environment and of trailhead facilities
- Increased opportunities to recreate close to home and use public transportation rather than private vehicles (through the addition of boat storage facilities)
- Increased awareness and provision of facilities that comply with pending Americans with Disabilities Act-Architectural Barriers Act (ADA-ABA) Accessibility Guidelines, and information regarding ADA/ABA design requirements for NMSB facilities
- Improved planning and more effective use of public funding for high priority improvements
- Localized economic benefits to waterfront and water-oriented businesses, and
- Expansion of the other regional trail systems (Bay Trail, Ridge Trail) to include the waters of the Bay

The need for the WT and the potential benefits associated with implementation of the WT Plan are described further in Chapter 2.

### **1.3 CEQA COMPLIANCE**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is regarded as the foundation of environmental law and policy in California. Its primary objectives are to:

- Disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities
- Identify ways to avoid or reduce adverse environmental effects

- Prevent or reduce adverse environmental effects by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures
- Disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects
- Foster interagency coordination in the review of projects, and
- Enhance public participation in the planning process

CEQA applies to all discretionary activities proposed to be carried out or approved by California public agencies, including state, regional, county, and local agencies, unless an exemption applies.

The State Coastal Conservancy (Conservancy), as the WT Plan lead agency under CEQA, has prepared this Draft Program EIR to address the potential environmental impacts of implementation of the Water Trail Plan and to satisfy the procedural, analytical, and public disclosure requirements of CEQA.<sup>1</sup> As a Program EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168), it analyzes the potential effects of implementing a regional plan, rather than the impacts of an individual project, and identifies mitigation measures that would be applied, as appropriate, to reduce or eliminate impacts at various Bay access locations. The key issues it focuses on are recreation, navigational safety, and biological resources (vegetation, wildlife, and aquatic resources). It also addresses hazardous materials; land use; aesthetics; cultural resources; public services; hydrology and water quality; transportation, circulation, and parking; and greenhouse gas emissions. The Conservancy will use this document to evaluate the WT Plan for approval.

A Draft EIR for the WT Plan was previously released to the public in June 2008 and extensive comments were received. The Conservancy, in coordination with the other Project Management Team (PMT) member agencies (staff from BCDC, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and the California Department of Boating and Waterways (Cal Boating)), is recirculating the Draft EIR after making revisions to most effectively and comprehensively address those comments, clarify potential impacts, and refine mitigation measures. General comments were addressed through overall revisions to this DEIR. Site-specific comments were retained for use during the trailhead designation process (see Chapter 2). An analysis of greenhouse gas emissions associated with implementation of the Water Trail Plan has been added in response to the Conservancy's policy of evaluating the effects of proposed projects on climate change, and because amendments to the CEQA guidelines requiring evaluation of greenhouse gas emissions were enacted in 2009 and took effect on March 18, 2010.

CEQA review for specific sites may tier off of this Program EIR after it is certified. The PMT, with assistance from an Advisory Committee to be formed, will reference the Final EIR in their site-specific review of trailheads as they are considered for inclusion into the WT and work with the site owners/managers to help them comply with CEQA, as appropriate to the circumstances of the individual site. The site owner/manager of each site, if a public agency, will serve as the CEQA lead agency for trailhead designation and implementation of any WT-related site enhancements, possibly tiering their site-specific CEQA reviews off of this document. Where

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Statutes (Public Resources Code Sections 21000, *et seq.*) and implementing Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 *et seq.*).

potential WT access sites are privately-owned, cities, counties, or other public agencies with discretionary authority over activities at that site would serve as lead agencies for CEQA. BCDC and other regulatory agencies may also use this document when issuing any permits required for trailhead improvement projects.

This document is intended to address the regional impacts of implementing the WT Plan on Bay-wide resources. It addresses general impacts that could occur with increased use and/or development of proposed WT sites. It does not include site-specific environmental analyses, but does consider proposed WT sites in the context of local and regional sensitive environmental resources. As such, it may be used to guide subsequent environmental review of designation/improvements at those sites. This Program EIR also addresses potential cumulative impacts of implementing the WT Plan in combination with other shoreline recreational projects, projected growth in NMSB use absent the Water Trail, and other projects with potentially overlapping impacts.

Provided the environmental impacts of future activities are adequately addressed in this document, additional CEQA documentation may not be required for individual (site-specific) projects. If additional environmental analysis is required for future activities and newly identified impacts, or to introduce new mitigation measures, subsequent environmental documents may be tiered from the analyses contained herein (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 [c] and Section 15177).

#### **1.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND SCOPING**

The CEQA process includes opportunities for the public to review and comment on projects that may affect the environment. CEQA provides for public participation through:

- Project scoping
- Publication of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Notice of Availability (NOA)
- Public review of environmental documents, and
- Public hearings

The Conservancy formally initiated the scoping process for this EIR by submitting the NOP to the California State Clearinghouse on November 15, 2007 and posting the NOP on the Conservancy website. In addition, a notification letter was issued to interested agencies, organizations, and members of the public. It included an attached Initial Study (see Appendix B) that summarized the proposed scope of environmental analyses to be included in the EIR. The public scoping meeting on the proposed EIR was held in San Francisco on November 28, 2007. Scoping comments were accepted through December 23, 2007. A wide range of comments were received during the scoping process. These comments are summarized in Appendix C, Summary of Scoping Comments. Other scoping activities for this Program EIR included early consultation with stakeholders and interagency consultation.

Distribution of the NOA for the June 2008 Draft EIR began on June 9, 2008 for the review period that commenced June 12, 2008. A public hearing for the 2008 DEIR was held on July 9, 2008. Written comments were accepted through July 28, 2008 from a total of 24 agencies, organizations and individuals. Those comments were considered in the development of this

recirculated DEIR. The public will have the opportunity to comment on this recirculated DEIR during a new public review period of 45 days or more that will be announced when this draft is released. The announcement of the new public review period will include the date, time, and location for a new public hearing. Any substantive written comments received at the public hearing or during the new review period will be responded to in writing in the Final EIR.

## 1.5 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction.** Provides an overview of the project, purpose and use of the EIR, public involvement process, and document organization.
- **Chapter 2: Project Description.** Describes the purpose, objectives and implementation of the WT; project location; and existing conditions and projected growth.
- **Chapter 3: Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.** Includes descriptions of the regulatory and environmental setting, and the impacts to each resource that may occur as a result of implementation of the WT Plan. Mitigation measures for potentially significant impacts are identified, and residual impacts (following application of mitigation measures) are assessed.
- **Chapter 4: Cumulative Impacts and other CEQA Sections.** Summarizes the project's growth inducement, unavoidable significant adverse impacts, cumulative impacts/mitigation, and irreversible/irretrievable impacts.
- **Chapter 5: Alternatives to the Project.** Describes the alternatives considered, and provides a summary of the potential impacts of two feasible alternatives compared to the potential impacts of the project. It also describes the No Project alternative and identifies the CEQA "environmentally superior" alternative.
- **Chapter 6: Report Preparers and References.** Identifies the preparers of this document and lists the references cited in the document.
- **Appendices.** The appendices provide additional information regarding the environmental review process and technical information that was used in the EIR analyses. Pursuant to CEQA requirements, materials and literature referenced in the EIR, but not included in Appendices, are maintained at the Conservancy offices in Oakland, California.
  - **Appendix A** – Water Trail Act
  - **Appendix B** – Initial Study
  - **Appendix C** – Summary of Scoping Comments
  - **Appendix D** – List of Strategies
  - **Appendix E** – Preliminary Environmental Effects Checklist for Trailhead Designation Process
  - **Appendix F** – Local Climate Action Plans (CAPs)
  - **Appendix G** - Methodology for Estimating Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions from the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail
  - **Appendix H** – Supplemental Strategies for the Enhanced Water Trail Plan Alternative

